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Abstract

Ulam has defined a history-dependent random sequence of integers by the recursion

\[ X_{n+1} = X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)}, \quad n \geq r \]

where \( U(n) \) and \( V(n) \) are independently and uniformly distributed on \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \), and the initial sequence, \( X_1 = x_1, \ldots, X_r = x_r \), is fixed. We consider the asymptotic properties of this sequence as \( n \to \infty \), showing, for example, that \( n^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \) converges to a non-degenerate random variable. We also consider the moments and autocovariance of the process, showing, for example, that when the initial condition is \( x_1 = 1 \) with \( r = 1 \), then \( \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-2}EX_n^2 = (2\pi)^{-1} \text{sinh}(\pi) \); and that for large \( m < n \), we have \( (mn)^{-1}EX_mX_n = (3\pi)^{-1} \text{sinh}(\pi) \).

We further consider new random adding processes where changes occur independently at discrete times with probability \( p \), or where changes occur continuously at jump times of an independent Poisson process. The processes are shown to have properties similar to those of the discrete time process with \( p = 1 \), and to be readily generalised to a wider range of related sequences.
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1 Introduction

Here we consider history-dependent processes in which, at any time, the next step depends on the entire past of the process. Specifically, every member of the sequence of values is the sum of two preceding values, chosen randomly.

This type of sequence was originally defined in discrete time by Beyer, Schrandt and Ulam (1969), thus

\[ X_{n+1} = X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)}, \quad n \geq 2, \] (1.1)

where \( X_1 = x_1 \) and \( X_2 = x_2 \) are given, and \( (U(n), V(n); n \geq 1) \) comprise a sequence of independent random variables such that for given \( n \), \( U(n) \) and \( V(n) \) are each uniformly distributed on \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \). They note that \( EX_n = \frac{1}{3}(x_1 + x_2)n \), for \( n \geq 3 \), and they conjectured from computer simulations that \( EX_n^2 \) grows quadratically with \( n \) as \( n \to \infty \). (They made 5000 simulations each
with 100 steps.) They also note that since the process \((X_n; n \geq 1)\) does not enjoy the Markov property, or similar simplifications, it is not straightforward to analyse.

The sequence defined in (1.1) was later considered by Ben-Naim and Krapivsky (2002), with the initial condition \(X_1 = x_1\). They note that in this case \(EX_n = nx_1, n \geq 1\). On the basis of further simulations (\(10^8\) realisations, each of 1000 steps), they conjectured that \(EX^2_n\) grows quadratically and also that \(EX^3_n\) grows with the cube of \(n\).

We shall verify these conjectures, and identify a martingale that further elucidates the behaviour of \((X_n; n \geq 1)\). We will then consider a new randomised adding sequence, in which changes occur randomly with probability \(p\). Finally we consider a related adding process in continuous time, in which changes are regulated by a Poisson process. Such processes have previously been introduced in the context of history-dependent growth processes (Clifford and Stirzaker, 2008). The process is shown to reproduce, in continuous time, the essential properties of Ulam’s discrete time sequence. Furthermore, similar analyses can be made of many more general processes, which we briefly outline.

### 2 The adding process in discrete time

Consider the process defined in (1.1) with initial fixed sequence \((X_1 = x_1, \ldots, X_r = x_r)\) and let \(s_r = \sum_{k=1}^r x_k\) and \(t_r = \sum_{k=1}^r x_k^2\). Denote the mean of \(X_n\) by \(m_n = EX_n\). By conditional expectation,

\[
m_{n+1} = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{r=1}^{n} m_r, \quad n \geq r,
\]

and an easy induction gives

\[
m_n = \frac{2n}{r(r+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{r} x_k, \quad n > r. \tag{2.1}
\]

For the second moment we have this:

**Theorem 1.**

\[
\frac{EX^2_n}{n^2} \to K(x_1, \ldots, x_r), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \tag{2.2}
\]

where

\[
K(x_1, \ldots, x_r) = \frac{\sinh(\pi)}{2\pi W_r} \left\{ 2(r+1) \left( \frac{t_r}{r} + \frac{s_r^2}{r^2} \right) - (r+2)x_r^2 \right\}, \tag{2.3}
\]

and

\[
W_r = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (r+1)^2 + 1 \right\} \prod_{k=1}^{r} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k^2} \right). \tag{2.4}
\]

**Proof.** Define \(S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k\) and let \(p_n = ES^2_n\) and \(q_n = EX^2_n\). By conditional expectation, for \(n \geq r\),

\[
q_{n+1} = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_k + \frac{2}{n^2} p_n. \tag{2.5}
\]
Also by conditional expectation,

\[ p_{n+1} = E(S_n^2 + 2S_nX_{n+1} + X_{n+1}^2) = \frac{n+4}{n} p_n + q_{n+1}. \]  

(2.6)

Eliminating \( p_n \), we have

\[(n + 1)^2 q_{n+2} - 2(n + 1)(n + 2)q_{n+1} + \{(n + 2)^2 + 1\} q_n = 0, \]  

(2.7)

with initial conditions

\[ q_r = x_r^2 \text{ and } q_{r+1} = \frac{2t_r}{r} + \frac{2s_r^2}{r^2}. \]  

(2.8)

By inspection, a particular solution of (2.7) is \( q^*_n = n + 1 \). From the theory of difference equations (Elaydi, 2005), a second, linearly independent, solution \( q^\circ_n \) is given by

\[ q^\circ_n = q^*_n \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{W_k}{(k+1)(k+2)}, \quad n > r, \]

where \( W_k \) is the Casoratian associated with the difference equation. We may set \( W_0 = 1 \) and in this instance \( W_n \) is given by the recursion

\[ W_{n+1} = \frac{(n+2)^2 + 1}{(n+1)^2} W_n \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (n+2)^2 + 1 \right\} \prod_{k=1}^{n+1} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k^2} \right) \]

\[ \sim n^2(2\pi)^{-1} \sinh(\pi), \]

where we have used the product limit of Euler (1748, §156) and where the notation \( f(n) \sim g(n) \) indicates that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 1 \).

The general solution of (2.7) is given by \( q_n = A(n + 1) + B q^\circ_n \), where the constants \( A \) and \( B \) are determined by the initial conditions (2.8). Hence for \( n > r \),

\[ q_n = \frac{(n + 1)x_r^2}{r + 1} + \frac{(n + 1)}{W_r} \left\{ 2(r+1) \left( \frac{t_r}{r} + \frac{s_r^2}{r^2} \right) - (r + 2)x_r^2 \right\} \sum_{k=r}^{n-1} \frac{W_k}{(k+1)(k+2)}, \]

and since \( W_n \sim n^2(2\pi)^{-1} \sinh(\pi) \), the limit (2.2) follows.

For the special case considered by Ben-Naim and Krapivsky (2002), the constant \( K \) becomes \( \sinh(\pi)/(2\pi) \approx 1.83804 \) in good agreement with the approximate value of 1.84 that they obtained by simulation.

Higher moments can be obtained in a similar fashion. For simplicity we restrict attention to the special case with initial condition \( x_1 = 1 \), as in Ben-Naim and Krapivsky (2002). For the third moment \( t_n = E(X_n^3) \) we define

\[ a_n^{[j,k]} = E\left\{ X_n^j S_{n-1}^k \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_n^{[j,k]} = E\left\{ \left( \sum_{\nu=1}^n X_\nu^j \right) S_n^k \right\}. \]
By the usual conditional expectation arguments we find
\[ a_{n+1}^{[0,3]} = a_n^{[0,3]} + 3a_n^{[1,2]} + 3a_n^{[2,1]} + a_n^{[3,0]}, \quad a_{n+1}^{[1,2]} = \frac{2}{n}a_{n+1}^{[0,3]}, \]
\[ a_{n+1}^{[2,1]} = \frac{2}{n^2}a_{n+1}^{[0,3]} + \frac{2}{n}b_{n+1}^{[2,1]}, \quad a_{n+1}^{[3,0]} = \frac{2}{n}b_{n+1}^{[3,0]} + \frac{6}{n^2}b_{n+1}^{[2,1]}, \]
\[ b_{n+1}^{[2,1]} = a_n^{[0,3]} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{n} \right) + a_{n+1}^{[2,1]} + a_{n+1}^{[3,0]}, \quad b_{n+1}^{[3,0]} = b_{n+1}^{[3,0]} + a_{n+1}^{[4,0]}, \]

with initial conditions \( a_1^{[j,k]} = 0 \) and \( b_1^{[j,k]} = 1 \). Reducing this system to a single recurrence for \( t_n = a_n^{[3,0]} \) yields
\[
(4n - 3)(n + 1)^2(n + 2)^2t_{n+3} - 3(4n^2 + 17n^2 + 14n - 21)(n + 1)^2t_{n+2} + (12n^5 + 87n^4 + 234n^3 + 177n^2 - 84n - 126)t_{n+1}
\]
\[
- (n^3 + 5n^2 + 11n - 5)(4n + 1)(n + 3)t_n = 0, \tag{2.9}
\]

with initial conditions \( t_1 = 1, t_2 = 8, t_3 = 63/2 \).

Applying the methods of Adams (1928); Birkoff (1930), we substitute trial solutions of the form \( n^\rho \delta^n \) and then \( n^\rho \) into (3.6) and determine the values of \( \sigma, \delta \) and \( \rho \) for which the leading term is zero. We find that \( \delta = 1 \) and then \( \rho = 1, 2, 3 \) and therefore conclude that \( t_n \) grows asymptotically with the cube of \( n \). Solving the recurrence numerically for the given initial conditions we find that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-3}t_n \approx 5.7946 \). This can be compared with the estimate 5.76 obtained by simulation in Ben-Naim and Krapivsky (2002).

For the fourth moment \( f_n = E(X_n^4) = a_n^{[4,0]} \) we have corresponding equations
\[ a_{n+1}^{[0,4]} = a_n^{[0,4]} + 4a_n^{[1,3]} + 6a_n^{[2,2]} + 4a_n^{[3,1]} + a_n^{[4,0]}, \quad a_{n+1}^{[1,3]} = \frac{2}{n}b_{n+1}^{[0,4]} + \frac{8}{n^2}b_{n+1}^{[3,1]} + \frac{6}{n^2}c_{n+1}^{[2]}, \]
\[ a_{n+1}^{[2,2]} = \frac{2}{n}a_{n+1}^{[0,4]}, \quad a_{n+1}^{[2,2]} = \frac{2}{n}b_{n+1}^{[2,2]} + \frac{2}{n^2}a_{n+1}^{[0,4]}, \quad a_{n+1}^{[3,1]} = \frac{2}{n}b_{n+1}^{[3,1]} + \frac{6}{n^2}a_{n+1}^{[2,2]}, \]
\[ b_{n+1}^{[2,2]} = b_{n+1}^{[2,2]} \left( 1 + \frac{4}{n^2} \right) + \frac{2}{n}a_{n+1}^{[3,1]} + 2a_{n+1}^{[2,2]} + 2a_{n+1}^{[3,1]} + a_{n+1}^{[4,0]}, \quad b_{n+1}^{[4,0]} = b_{n+1}^{[4,0]} + a_{n+1}^{[4,0]}, \]
\[ c_{n+1}^{[2]} = c_{n+1}^{[2]} \left( 1 + \frac{4}{n^2} \right) + \frac{4}{n^2}b_{n+1}^{[2,2]} + a_{n+1}^{[4,0]}, \quad b_{n+1}^{[3,1]} = b_{n+1}^{[3,1]} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{n} \right) + a_{n+1}^{[3,1]} + a_{n+1}^{[4,0]}, \]

where \( c_n^{[2]} = E \left\{ \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k^2 \right)^2 \right\} \). Again, reducing the system to a single recurrence for \( f_n \) and applying the methods of Adams (1928); Birkoff (1930), we find that \( f_n \) grows asymptotically with the fourth power of \( n \). Solving the recurrence numerically we have \( \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-4}f_n \approx 31.585 \).

An understanding of further properties of the process \((X_n; n \geq 1)\) is greatly aided by the content of the following:

**Lemma 1.** Let \( M_n = S_n/(n(n + 1)) \) where \( S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \), then \( (M_n; n \geq r) \) is a martingale with respect to the increasing sequence of \( \sigma \)-fields \( (\mathcal{F}_n; n \geq r) \) generated by the sequence \((X_n)\), or equivalently \((S_n)\). Furthermore, there exists a non-degenerate random variable \( M \), such that \( M_n \) converges to \( M \) almost surely and in mean-square as \( n \to \infty \), where

\[
EM = \frac{1}{r(r + 1)} \sum_{k=1}^{r} x_k \quad \text{and} \quad E(M^2) = \frac{1}{6}K(x_1, \ldots, x_r).
\]
Proof. By conditional expectation
\[ E(M_{n+1} | F_n) = \frac{E(S_n + X_{n+1} | F_n)}{(n+1)(n+2)} = \frac{S_n + 2S_n/n}{(n+1)(n+2)} = M_n. \]
The mean of \( M_n \), and hence of \( M \), follows from (2.1). Dividing (2.5) by \( n^2 \), allowing \( n \to \infty \), and noting (2.2), yields
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-4} E(S_n^2) = \frac{1}{6} K(x_1, \ldots, x_r). \] (2.10)
The existence of this limit ensures that \( EM_n^2 \) is uniformly bounded for all \( n \). The probabilistic limit results then follow from the martingale convergence theorem (Doob, 1953).

As an immediate corollary, we remark that
\[ E(X_m M_n | F_m) = \frac{X_m S_m}{m(m+1)}, \quad \text{for } n \geq m. \] (2.11)

We now turn to consider the auto-covariance properties of the process \((X_n)\), where we have the following result.

Theorem 2. Let \( m, n \to \infty \), with \( m \leq n \) then,
\[ n^{-2} E(X_m X_n) \to \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3} \theta K & \text{if } m/n \to \theta \in (0, 1), \\ K & \text{if } m = n, \end{cases} \] (2.12)
where \( K = K(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \) is defined in (2.3) above.

Proof. By conditional expectation, we have
\[ E(X_{n+1} S_{n+1}) = \frac{2}{n} p_n + q_{n+1}, \]
so that (2.10) and theorem 1 give
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-3} E(X_{n+1} S_{n+1}) = \frac{1}{3} K. \] (2.13)
Again by conditional expectation, we have
\[ E(X_m X_{n+1}) = \frac{2}{n} E(X_m S_n), \quad n \geq m, \] (2.14)
so that with \( m = n \)
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-2} E(X_n X_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} 2n^{-3} E(X_n S_n) = \frac{2}{3} K. \] (2.15)
Finally, considering \( m, n \to \infty \) with \( m/n \to \theta \), for some fixed \( \theta \in (0, 1) \), by (2.14) and (2.11) we have
\[ \frac{E(X_m X_n)}{n(n+1)} = \frac{2E(X_m S_{n-1})}{(n-1)n(n+1)} = \frac{2E(X_m S_m)}{(n-1)m(m+1)} \to \frac{2}{3} \theta K. \]
2.1 Sample paths

We can now give an informal but quite precise description of a typical trajectory of the process \((X_n, n \geq 1)\) for large \(n\). From lemma 1 we see that each trajectory has its own limiting value of \(M_n = S_n/(n(n+1))\). These values vary from trajectory to trajectory with \(EM_n^2 \to K/6\) as \(n \to \infty\). Computer simulations show that, when scaled by \(S_n/(n+1)\), the variables \(X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)}\) have approximate probability density \(f_W(w) = we^{-w}, w > 0\), as illustrated in figure 1. This is not unexpected since a related energy splitting model (Blackwell and Mauldin, 1985) has \(f_W(w)\) as its fixed point density. Specifically, the process \((X_n, n \geq 1)\) can be reformulated as follows. At stage \(n+1\), sample from the collection \(\{Y_k, k = 1, \ldots, n\}\) where \(Y_k = X_k/k\), by selecting an index \(k\) uniformly from \(\{1, \ldots, n\}\). Then multiply \(Y_k\) by \(k/(n + 1)\), repeat independently and add the results to obtain \(Y_{n+1}\). The analogous splitting model is defined by the distributional equality \(W = UW_1 + VW_2\) where \(U\) and \(V\) are independent \(U(0, 1)\) variables and \(W_1\) and \(W_2\) are independent copies of \(W\). It is straightforward to show that \(f_W(w)\) is the fixed point density and it also follows that \(UW_1\) and \(VW_2\) are independently exponentially distributed. It can then be argued that \(Y\), the limiting value of \(Y_n\), is of the form \(WM\) where \(M\) is the limiting distribution of \(M_n\). As a consequence, the moments of \(Y\) should have a simple relation to those of \(M\), for example \(E(Y^2) = 6E(M^2)\).

\[
M_{n+1} = \frac{S_{n+1}}{(n+1)(n+2)} = \frac{S_n + X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)}}{(n+1)(n+2)} = M_n \left\{ 1 + \frac{W_n - 2}{n + 2} \right\},
\]

where \(W_n = (X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)})/M_n\), and since we have empirical evidence that \((W_n)\) are independently distributed from the same distribution, we can anticipate that the limiting distribution of \(M_n\) will be approximately log-normal or, more generally, in the log-gamma family. Figure 1
shows the estimated density of \( \log(2M_n) \), simulated from the initial condition \( x_1 = 1 \), compared with fitted gamma and normal densities. (The factor of 2 is introduced for convenience, so that the mean of \( 2M_n \) is 1 with this initial condition.) The log-gamma density is seen to provide an excellent fit. As a more rigorous test, we can compare the numerically determined moments of \( 2M \) with those of the candidate distributions. Using \( \mu_k = E\{(2M)^k\} = E\{(2Y)^k\}/E(W^k) \) for \( k = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) and the moments of \( Y \) obtained in the previous section we find \( \mu_1 = 1, \mu_2 = 1.225, \mu_3 = 1.932, \mu_4 = 4.211 \). The fourth moment of a log-gamma distribution fitted by the first three of these moments is 4.194 which is within half a percent of the value \( \mu_4 \).

3 \hspace{1em} The \( p \)-adding process in discrete time

We now consider a simple modification of the process defined in (1.1), where history-dependent updates occur randomly and independently with probability \( p \), where \( p < 1 \). The new process is as follows.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \((J_n, n \geq 1)\) be a sequence of independent Bernoulli variables each with success probability \( p \) and let \((U(n))\) and \((V(n))\) be sequences of independent variables (also independent of \((J_n))\) such that for any given \( n \), \( U(n) \) and \( V(n) \) are each uniformly distributed on \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \). The \( p \)-adding process with fixed initial condition \((X_1 = x_1, \ldots, X_r = x_r)\) is defined by

\[
X_{n+1} = J_n [X_{U(n)} + X_{V(n)}] + (1 - J_n) X_n, \quad n \geq r.
\]

**Theorem 3.** The \( p \)-adding process has mean

\[
EX_n = (\nu + pn) \left\{ \frac{x_r}{\nu + pr} + \frac{C pr}{\nu - 1} \sum_{k=r}^{n-1} \frac{\nu^{k-1}}{k(\nu + pk)(1 + pk)} \right\}, \quad n \geq r,
\]

where \( \nu = 1 - p, C = 2s_r(\nu + pr)/r - (1 + \nu + pr)x_r \) and \( s_r = \sum_{k=1}^{r} x_k \), with the convention that the summation in (3.2) is zero when the upper limit is less than the lower.

**Proof.** Let \( m_n = EX_n \), then by the usual conditioning arguments

\[
m_{n+1} = \nu m_n + \frac{2p}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} m_k, \quad n \geq r,
\]

which can be recast as the difference equation

\[
(n + 1)m_{n+2} - [n(1 + \nu) + p]m_{n+1} + nm_n, n \geq r.
\]

By inspection, \( \nu + pn \) is seen to be a solution and the Casoratian can be shown to be \( \nu^{k-1}/k \). The general solution is then

\[
(\nu + pn) \left\{ A + B \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\nu^{k-1}}{k(\nu + pk)(1 + pk)} \right\}, \quad n \geq r,
\]

where \( A \) and \( B \) are arbitrary constants. The solution (3.2) then follows from the initial conditions \( m_r = x_r \) and \( m_{r+1} = \nu x_r + 2ps_r/r \). \( \square \)
From (3.2), since the partial sum has a finite limit, we see that $m_n$ grows linearly with $n$ as $n \to \infty$. For the second moment we have

**Theorem 4.**

\[
\frac{EX_n^2}{n^2} \to K(p, x_1, \ldots, x_r), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,
\] (3.4)

where $K$ is a function of $p$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_r$; equal to $K$ in (2.3) when $p = 1$.

**Proof.** Define $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$ and let $p_n = ES_n^2$, $q_n = EX_n^2$, $w_n = EX_nS_{n-1}$ and $t_n = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k$. Using the usual conditional expectation arguments, we have

\[
q_{n+1} = (1 - p)q_n + p \left[ \frac{2}{n} t_n + \frac{2}{n^2} p_n \right], \quad w_{n+1} = (1 - p)(w_n + v_n) + \frac{2p}{n} p_n, \quad n \geq r, \tag{3.5}
\]

with the additional identities $t_{n+1} = t_n + q_n$ and $p_n = p_{n-1} + 2w_n + q_n$. Omitting the details for the sake of brevity, this system of recurrences can be reduced to the single fourth order linear difference equation for $q_n$.

\[
(n + 3)^2 q_{n+4} + [(2p - 4)n^2 + (4p - 18)n - 3p - 21]q_{n+3} + [(6 - 6p + p^2)n^2 + (18 - 8p - 2p^2)n + 15 + 2p^2]q_{n+2} - (1 - p)(4 - 2p)^2 n^2 + (2p + 6)n + 3][q_{n+1} + (1 - p)^2 n^2 q_n = 0. \tag{3.6}
\]

As before, we refer to Adams (1928); Birkhoff (1930) and substitute trial solutions of the form $n^\rho \delta^n$ and then $n^\rho$ into (3.6). By considering the leading terms in the resulting expressions, we find that $\delta = 1, 1 - p$ and then $\rho = 1, 2$ and therefore conclude that $q_n$ grows quadratically as $n \to \infty$. \hfill \square

### 3.1 Numerical results

We have investigated the behaviour of $K(p, x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ numerically for various values of $p$ in the case $x_r = r = 1$. For comparison purposes, we rescale time so that for each $p$ jumps occur at mean rate $1$. On this time scale the limiting constant is $K(p, 1)/p^2$. The results are illustrated in figure 2. The exact value at $p = 1$ is given in theorem 1. Theorem 7 for the continuized model provides the limiting value as $p \to 0$, namely $\cosh(\pi \sqrt{7}/2)/(4\pi) \approx 2.53961$.

Note that a simple lower bound for $K(p, 1)/p^2$ in all cases can be obtained from the observation that $ES_n^2 \geq (ES_n)^2$. Then, since $n^{-2}S_n \to \frac{1}{2}p$ from (3.2) and $n^{-4}ES_n^2 \to \frac{1}{6}K(p, 1)$, as will be shown in theorem 5 below, it follows that $K(p, 1)/p^2 \geq 1.5$. A similar calculation in terms of $EX_n^2$ yields the uniformly worse lower bound of 1.

Numerical values of the product moment $n^{-2}E(X_mX_n)$ for the $p$-adding process are shown in figure 3. A simple limiting pattern emerges with a discontinuity at $m = n$, at which the value drops by one third. This phenomenon is explained in theorem 5 below.

In considering the product moment of the $p$-adding process with $p < 1$ we are hindered by the lack of a suitable martingale which, in the case $p = 1$, yields (2.11). Nevertheless, similar conclusions can be drawn for the $p$-adding process, as follows.
Theorem 5. Let \( m, n \to \infty \), with \( m \leq n \) then the limiting product moment of the \( p \)-adding process \( (X_n) \) with \( p < 1 \) is given by

\[
n^{-2}E(X_m X_n) \to \begin{cases} 
\frac{2}{3} \theta K & \text{if } m/n \to \theta \in (0, 1), \\
K & \text{if } m = n,
\end{cases}
\]  

(3.7)

where \( K = K(p, x_1, \ldots, x_r) \) is defined in (3.4) above.

Proof. First note that as a consequence of theorem 4, we have \( t_n/n^3 \to 1/3K \). Dividing the first equation in (3.5) by \( n^2 \), we then have \( p_n/n^4 \to \frac{1}{6}K \) and dividing the second equation by \( n^3 \) we have \( w_n/n^3 \to \frac{1}{2}K \). By the usual conditioning arguments we also have \( E(X_{n+1}S_{n+1}) = \nu[E(X_nS_n) + q_n] + 2pn^{-1}p_n \) and, dividing both sides by \( n^3 \), we have \( n^{-3}E(X_nS_n) \to \frac{1}{4}K \) as \( n \to \infty \)

Now let \( c_{m,n} = E(X_m X_n) \) then, as in (3.3), we have

\[
c_{m,n+1} = \nu c_{m,n} + \frac{2p}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{m,k}, \quad n \geq m \geq r,
\]

(3.8)

with solution

\[
c_{m,n} = (\nu + pn) \left\{ A + B \sum_{k=r}^{n-1} \frac{\nu^{k-1}}{k(\nu + pk)(1 + pk)} \right\}, \quad n \geq m \geq r,
\]

where \( A \) and \( B \) can be determined from the initial conditions \( c_{m,m} = q_m \) and \( c_{m,m+1} = \nu q_m + 2pn^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{m,k} \). Thus

\[
c_{m,n} = (\nu + pn) \left\{ \frac{c_{m,m+1}}{\nu + p(m+1)} \frac{H_{n-1}}{H_m} - \frac{q_m}{\nu + pm} \frac{H_{n-1} - H_m}{H_m} \right\}, \quad n \geq m \geq r,
\]

(3.9)
where \( H_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \nu^{k-1}/[k(\nu + pk)(1 + pk)] \).

Returning to (3.8) with \( n = m \) we have \( c_{m,m+1} = \nu q_m + 2pm^{-1}E(X_mS_m) \). Dividing by \( m^2 \) and using the earlier limit results we thus have \( c_{m,m+1}/m^2 \to \frac{2}{3}K \). Finally dividing (3.9) by \( n^2 \), letting both \( m \to \infty \) and \( n \to \infty \) so that \( m/n \to \theta < 1 \) and noting that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} H_n < \infty \), we have \( c_{m,n}/n^2 \to \frac{2}{3}\theta K \), as claimed.

4 The continuized adding process

A familiar method for gaining insight into many discrete-time processes is to consider analogous problems in continuous time. And of course, such processes are of natural interest in their own right. In this case the underlying idea is that the jumps of the discrete process \( (X_n) \) should take place at the jump instants of a Poisson process \( (N(t)) \); the process \( (X_n) \) is then said to be subordinate to \( (N(t)) \). Such continuized (or Poisson-regulated) processes have been used previously in analysing other history dependent random sequences (Clifford and Stirzaker, 2008) and are also discussed by Feller (1966). We define the continuized random adding process thus:

**Definition 4.1.** Let \( (T_r; r \geq 1) \) be the successive jump times of a Poisson process \( (N(t), t > \tau) \) where \( \tau \geq 0 \) and \( N(\tau) = 0 \). For notational convenience let \( T_0 = \tau \). Without essential loss of generality, we will take the Poisson intensity \( \lambda \) to be 1. Let \( (U_r; r \geq 1) \) and \( (V_r; r \geq 1) \) be independent sequences of independent random variables, such that \( U_r \) and \( V_r \) are uniformly distributed on \([0, T_r] \). With initial conditions \( X(t) = x(t), 0 \leq t \leq \tau \), the process is defined by

\[
X(t) = X(T_{r-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad T_{r-1} \leq t < T_r, \\
X(T_r) = X(U_r) + X(V_r).
\]

(4.1)

Note that many, more general, constructions are possible, in that

(a) we could permit \( U_r \) and \( V_r \) to have a distribution other than uniform,

(b) we could consider weighting factors so that

\[ X(T_r) = AX(U_r) + BX(V_r), \]

where \( A \) and \( B \) are constants, or even random variables,

(c) the regulating Poisson process could be non-homogeneous, of rate \( \lambda(t) \).

We return later to consider some of these more general problems.

For the process \( (X(t)) \) of definition 4.1, we have this

**Theorem 6.** Let \( m(t) = E(X(t)) \) be the mean of \( X(t) \), then for \( t \geq \tau > 0 \)

\[
m(t) = (1 + t) \left( \frac{x(\tau)}{1 + \tau} + C \int_\tau^t \frac{e^{-y}}{y(1 + y)^2} dy \right),
\]

(4.2)
where
\[
\frac{Ce^{-\tau}}{\tau(1+\tau)} + \frac{2 + \tau}{1+\tau}x(\tau) = \frac{2}{\tau} \int_0^\tau x(u)du.
\]
When \(\tau = 0\), and \(x(0) = 1\), this yields
\[
m(t) = 1 + t. \tag{4.3}
\]

**Proof.** for small \(h > 0\), let \(I_{h,t}\) be the indicator of the event that \(N(t + h) = N(t)\). Then by conditional expectation, for \(t \geq \tau\),
\[
m(t + h) = E\{E[X(t + h)|I_{h,t}]\} = (1 - h)m(t) + hE\{X(U) + X(V)\} + o(h),
\]
where \(U\) and \(V\) are uniformly and independently distributed over \([0,t]\). Hence
\[
m' + m = \frac{2}{t} \int_0^t m(u)du.
\]
It follows that
\[
tm'' + (1 + t)m' - m = 0, \tag{4.4}
\]
where \(m'\) and \(m''\) are the first and second derivatives of \(m(t)\).

By inspection, \(m(t) = 1 + t\) is a particular solution of (4.4). The complete solution (4.2) follows routinely, on applying the initial conditions
\[
m(\tau) = x(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad m'(\tau) = -x(\tau) + \frac{2}{\tau} \int_0^\tau x(u)du.
\]

We observe that the special case (4.3) essentially reproduces the behaviour of the discrete adding process started at \(X_1 = 1\). We note for reference that
\[
\int_\tau^\infty \frac{e^{-u}}{u(1+u)^2}du = -Ei(x) - \frac{e^{-x}}{1+x}, \tag{4.5}
\]
where \(Ei(\cdot)\) is the exponential integral (Abramowitz and Stegun, 1965).

For the second moment \(q(t) = E(X^2(t))\), we have

**Theorem 7.** As \(t \to \infty\), \(q(t)\) grows quadratically with \(t\). In particular, when \(\tau = 0\) and \(x(0) = 1\), we have \(q(t)/t^2 \to \cosh(\pi \sqrt{7}/2)/(4\pi) \approx 2.53961\), as \(t \to \infty\). The second moment is seen to have the same quadratic asymptotic growth behaviour as that of the discrete time processes, but with a larger constant; as perhaps is to be expected intuitively.

**Proof.** Conditioning on events of the Poisson process \((N(t))\) during the interval \((t,t+h)\), as above, gives
\[
q' + q = E\{X^2(U)\} + E\{X^2(V)\} + 2E\{X(U)X(V)\}, \tag{4.6}
\]
where $U$ and $V$ are independently uniform, so that

$$q' + q = \frac{2}{t} \int_0^t q(u)du + \frac{2}{t^2} \int_0^t \int_0^t c(u,v)dudv,$$

(4.7)

where $c(u,v) = E\{X(u)X(v)\}$.

In addition, for $u < t$, by similar conditioning, we have

$$\frac{\partial c(u,t)}{\partial t} + c(u,t) = \frac{2}{t} \int_0^t c(u,y)dy,$$

(4.8)

and, for $v < t$,

$$\frac{\partial c(t,v)}{\partial t} + c(t,v) = \frac{2}{t} \int_0^t c(x,v)dx.$$

(4.9)

Now define $Q(t) = \int_0^t \int_0^t c(u,v)dudv$, with first derivative

$$Q' = \int_0^t c(u,t)du + \int_0^t c(t,v)dv.$$

(4.10)

Differentiating again and substituting from (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain

$$Q'' + Q' = 2q + \frac{4}{t}Q.$$

(4.11)

Eliminating $Q$ from (4.11) and (4.7) gives

$$t^2q^{(iv)} + (6t + t^2)q''' + (6 + 4t + t^2)q'' - (6 + 2t)q' + 2q = 0.$$

(4.12)

Following Erdélyi (1956), we determine the asymptotic growth rate of $q(t)$, as $t \to \infty$, by substituting trial solutions of the form $q_1 = t^\sigma e^{\delta t}$ and $q_2 = t^\rho$; this procedure yields the leading term in an asymptotic expansion developed in inverse powers of $t$. For $q_1$, we find that the leading term is zero when $\delta^4 + 2\delta^3 + \delta^2 = 0$ whence $\delta = 0$ or $\delta = -1$. We therefore consider substitutions of the form $q_2$, which then gives $(\rho - 2)(\rho - 1) = 0$. Thus $q(t) \sim Kt^2$, as asserted, where $K$ is a constant depending on the initial conditions $\{x(t), 0 \leq t \leq \tau\}$.

For the base case where $\tau = 0$ and $x(0) = 1$, we can determine the coefficient $K$ explicitly. We start by defining the transform $g(s) = s^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-t/s}q(t)dt$ for $s > 0$. The function $g$ is well defined since we have established that $q(t) \sim Kt^2$. The asymptotic behaviours of $g$ and $q$ are related by a Tauberian theorem (Feller, 1966, page 220), namely

$$q(t) \sim K t^\alpha, \text{ as } t \to \infty \text{ if and only if } g(s) \sim K s^{\alpha} \Gamma(\alpha + 1), \text{ as } s \to \infty.$$

(4.13)

For the base case, using (4.7) and (4.10), the initial conditions for $q$ are found to be $q(0) = 1$, $q'(0) = 3$, $q''(0) = 8/3$ and $q'''(0) = 4/9$. Applying the transform to (4.12), after some reduction, we have

$$s(s + 1)^2 g''(s) + 2(1 - s^2)g'(s) + 2(s - 3)g(s) = 0,$$

(4.14)
with \( g(0) = 1 \) and \( g'(0) = 3 \). The method of Frobenius provides solutions for \( g(s) \) of the form

\[
P(s) = 1 + 3s + 8s^2/3 + \ldots, \quad Q(s) = \log(s)[2 + 6s + 16s^2/3 + \ldots] + s^{-1}[1 + 4s + 2s^2 + \ldots].
\]

Clearly \( P(s) \) is the required solution of (4.14) but, expressed as a power series, it provides no immediate access to the asymptotic growth of \( g(s) \). An alternative pair of solutions can be found by shifting to the singular point \( s = -1 \), i.e. by defining \( g(s) = u(1+s)(1+s)^{2+\beta} \) and considering the differential equation satisfied by \( u \). Taking \( \beta \) to be \( \frac{1}{2}(1-i\sqrt{7}) \) or its complex conjugate, we find

\[
w(w - 1)u''(w) + 2[(\beta + 1)w - \beta]u'(w) + 2\beta^2 u(w) = 0, \tag{4.15}
\]
a hypergeometric differential equation (Abramowitz and Stegun, 1965, §15.5.1) with a solution \( G(\beta, w) = F(\beta, \beta + 1, 2\beta, w) \) where \( F \) is the hypergeometric function defined in (Abramowitz and Stegun, 1965, §15.1.1). It follows that (4.14) has solution

\[
g(s) = B_1(1+s)^{2+\beta}G(\beta, 1+s) + B_2(1+s)^{2+\beta}G(\bar{\beta}, 1+s), \tag{4.16}
\]

where \( \bar{\beta} \) is the complex conjugate of \( \beta \) and \( (B_1, B_2) \) are complex constants chosen so that \( g(s) = P(s) \).

First note that the general Frobenius solution has the property that \( s[C_1P(s) + C_2Q(s)] \) converges to \( C_2 \) as \( s \to 0 \). So, in order that \( C_2 = 0 \) we must have \( sg(s) \to 0 \) as \( s \to 0 \) in (4.16). Furthermore using Abramowitz and Stegun (1965, §15.3.3) we have \(-sG(\beta, 1+s) = F(\beta, \beta - 1, 2\beta, 1+s)\), and using Abramowitz and Stegun (1965, §15.1.20), the limiting value of the right-hand side of this equation, as \( s \to 0 \), is given by \( A(\beta) = \Gamma(2\beta)/[\Gamma(\beta)\Gamma(\beta + 1)] \). It follows that as \( s \to 0 \), \( -sg(s) \to B_1A(\beta) + B_2A(\bar{\beta}) = 0 \) and hence \( B_2/B_1 = -A(\beta)/A(\bar{\beta}) \).

The solution we require is then

\[
B_0[A(\bar{\beta})(1+s)^{2+\beta}G(\beta, 1+s) - A(\beta)(1+s)^{2+\beta}G(\bar{\beta}, 1+s)], \tag{4.17}
\]

where \( B_0 \) has to be found so that \( g(s) \) satisfies the initial condition \( g(0) = 1 \). From Abramowitz and Stegun (1965, §15.3.12) the constant term in the expansion of \( G(\beta, 1+s) \) about \( s = 0 \), i.e. the term with \( n = 0 \), is given by

\[
\frac{\Gamma(2\beta)}{\Gamma(\beta - 1)\Gamma(\beta)}[\psi(\beta) + \psi(\beta + 1) - \psi(1) - \psi(2)] = H(\beta) \quad \text{(say),}
\]

where \( \psi(z) = d/dz \log\Gamma(z) \). Thus the constant term on expanding \( (1+s)^{2+\beta}G(\beta, 1+s) \) is \( H(\beta) - (2 + \beta)A(\beta) \), and after some simplification, the constant term in (4.17) is

\[
B_0[A(\bar{\beta})H(\beta) - \beta A(\beta)] - A(\beta)[H(\bar{\beta}) - \bar{\beta}A(\bar{\beta})] = B_0i\sqrt{7},
\]

from which it follows that \( B_0 = (i\sqrt{7})^{-1} \).
We now have the required solution explicitly in the form (4.17). It remains to determine the asymptotic behaviour as \( s \to \infty \). From Abramowitz and Stegun (1965, §15.3.4) we have \( G(\beta, 1 + s) = (-s)^{-\beta} F(\beta, \beta - 1, 2\beta, s^{-1}(1 + s)) \), so that, from the definition of \( A(\beta) \),

\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} (1 + s)^{\beta} G(\beta, 1 + s) = \lim_{s \to \infty} \left( \frac{1 + s}{-s} \right)^{\beta} A(\beta) = ie^{\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7}} A(\beta).
\]

Consequently using the form (4.17)

\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} \frac{g(s)}{(1 + s)^2} = \frac{A(\beta)A(\beta)}{\sqrt{7}} \left[ e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7}} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7}} \right] = \frac{\cosh\left(\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7}\right)}{2\pi \sinh(\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7})} \times 2 \sinh(\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7}).
\]

Therefore \( g(s)/s^2 \to \cosh(\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7})/(2\pi) \) and from the Tauberian relation (4.13) with \( \alpha = 2 \) we have \( K = \cosh(\frac{1}{2}\pi \sqrt{7})/(4\pi) \) as claimed.

For the product-moment function \( c(s, t) = E\{X(s)X(t)\} \) we have this.

**Theorem 8.** For \( \tau \leq s < t \)

\[
c(s, t) = (1 + t) \left\{ \frac{q(s)}{1 + s} + e^s [(1 + s)Q' - (2 + s)sq] \int_s^t \frac{e^{-y}}{y(1 + y)^2} dy \right\},
\]

and if \( s, t \to \infty \), with \( s \leq t \) then,

\[
t^{-2}c(s, t) \to \begin{cases} \frac{2}{3} \theta K & \text{if } s/t \to \theta \in (0, 1), \\ K & \text{if } s = t. \end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** From (4.8) we have \( tc'' + (1 + t)c' - c = 0 \), where \( c = c(u, t) \), \( u < t \) and \( c' \) indicates that differentiation is with respect to \( t \). This is essentially (4.4), so that we have as before

\[
c(s, t) = (1 + t) \left[ A(s) + B(s) \int_s^t \frac{e^{-y}}{y(1 + y)^2} dy \right],
\]

for suitable \( A(s) \) and \( B(s) \). The boundary conditions at \( t = s \) are

\[c(s, t)|_{t=s} = q(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial c(s, t)}{\partial t}|_{t=s} = Q'(s)/s - q(s),\]

the latter following from (4.8) and (4.10). The required result (4.19) then follows.

Now set \( s = \theta t \) in (4.19), where \( \theta \) is a fixed number between 0 and 1. As \( s, t \to \infty \), either integrating by parts or by use of 8.215 in Gradshetz and Ryzhik (2000), we find that the leading term in the asymptotic expansion of the integral term is \((\theta t)^{-3}e^{-\theta t}\). From theorem 7, we have \( q \sim Kt^2 \) and hence \( \int_0^t q(u)du \sim Kt^3/2 \), so that from (4.7) \( Q \sim Kt^4/6 \) and hence \( Q' \sim 2Kt^3/3 \). Substituting these asymptotic results in (4.19), after some reduction, we have

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} t^{-2}c(\theta t, t) = \frac{2}{3} \theta K,
\]

as required. Once again we note that this is similar to the behaviour of the product-moment in the discrete case.
For the third moment $E\{X^3(t)\}$, we remark that a similar asymptotic analysis may be pursued. Introducing the notation $S_j(t) = E\{\int_0^t X^j(u)du\}$ and

$$\alpha_j = E\{X^j(t)|S_1(t)|^3\}, \quad \beta_j = E\{S_j(t)|S_1(t)|^3\}, \quad \gamma_j = E\{X^j(t)S_{3-j}(t)\},$$

and using the usual conditional expectation arguments, we have

$$\alpha'_0 = 3\alpha_1, \quad \alpha'_1 = -\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + \frac{2}{t}\alpha_0, \quad \alpha'_2 = -\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \frac{2}{t}\beta_2 + \frac{2}{t^2}\alpha_0,$$

$$\alpha'_3 = -\alpha_3 + \frac{2}{t}\beta_3 + \frac{6}{t}\beta_2, \quad \beta'_2 = \alpha_2 + \gamma_1, \quad \beta'_3 = \alpha_3, \quad \gamma'_1 = -\gamma_1 + \alpha_3 + \frac{2}{t}\beta_2.$$

Reducing this system to a single differential equation for $\beta_3 = E\{\int_0^t X^3(u)du\}$ yields

$$t^4\beta_3^{(vi)} + 4(t + 4)t^3\beta_3^{(v)} + 2(3t^2 + 21t + 37)t^2\beta_3^{(v)} + 2(2t^3 + 15t^2 + 40t + 54)t\beta_3^{(iv)} + (t^4 - 2t^3 - 44t^2 - 80t + 36)\beta_3^{(iii)} - (6t^3 + 32t^2 + 72t + 112)\beta_3'' + (18t^2 + 92t + 136)\beta_3' - 12(2t + 3)\beta_3 = 0.$$ (4.22)

Again following Erdélyi (1956) we consider the asymptotic expansion of $\beta_3$ developed in inverse powers of $t$ for large $t$, and find the leading term by substituting trial solutions of the form $\beta_3 = t^\sigma e^{\rho t}$ and $t^\rho$. These show that $\delta$ is either 0 or $-1$ and $\rho$ is either 2, 3 or 4. We conclude that $E\{\int_0^t X^3(u)du\}$ grows as $t^4$, and hence that $E\{X^3(t)\}$ grows as $t^3$.

## 5 Generalized random adding

A natural generalization of the simple adding process is to allow weighting and non-uniform selection from the past. We define such a process thus:

**Definition 5.1.** With the notation and structure of definition 4.1, at jump times $(T_n)$, set

$$X(T_n) = AX(U_n) + BX(U_n), \quad n \geq 1,$$

where now $(U_r)$ and $(V_r)$ comprise sequences of independent random variables with respective distribution functions

$$P\{U_r \leq u | T_r = t\} = (u/t)^\alpha, \quad 0 < u < t,$$

$$P\{V_r \leq v | T_r = t\} = (v/t)^\beta, \quad 0 < v < t.$$

Here $A$ and $B$ are non-zero constants, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are positive constants. As in section 4, we assume that the initial values in the process are fixed at $X(t) = x(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$.

**Theorem 9.** Let $m(t) = EX(t)$ then $m(t)$ grows asymptotically as $t^\sigma$ as $t \to \infty$, where $\sigma$ is a root of the following equation; in general that root having the larger real part:

$$\sigma^2 + [\beta(1 - B) + \alpha(1 - A)]\sigma + [(1 - A - B)\alpha\beta] = 0.$$ (5.1)
Proof. Conditioning on the events of the Poisson process \((N(t))\), we have

\[
m' + m = \frac{A\alpha}{t^\alpha} \int_0^t u^{\alpha-1} m(u)du + \frac{B\beta}{t^\beta} \int_0^t v^{\beta-1} m(v)dv.
\]

Differentiating with respect to \(t\), we obtain, for \(t \geq \tau\),

\[
(1 - A - B)\alpha m + t^2 m''' + [(\alpha + \beta + 1)t + t^2]m'' + \{\alpha\beta + [1 + \beta(1 - B) + \alpha(1 - A)]t\}m' = 0.
\]

(5.2)

Following Erdélyi (1956), substituting the usual trial solutions in (5.2) and equating coefficients of the highest order terms, we find that \(m(t)\) grows asymptotically as \(t^\sigma\), where \(\sigma\) is given by (5.1). Note that when \(\alpha = \beta = 1\) and \(A = B = 1\) then \(\sigma = 1\), as we know from 4.3.

We investigate the implications of equation (5.1) beginning with the question of when the roots are imaginary, corresponding to potentially oscillatory behaviour for \(m(t)\). For brevity of notation, we write \(x = 1 - A\) and \(y = 1 - B\). The roots \(\sigma_1\) and \(\sigma_2\) of (5.1) are real or imaginary according as the function

\[
f(\alpha, \beta, x, y) = \alpha^2 x^2 + 2\alpha\beta xy + \beta^2 y^2 - 4\alpha\beta(x + y - 1)
\]

is greater than or equal to, or less than, zero.

We observe that \(f = 0\) defines a parabola \(P\) in the \((x, y)\) plane for suitable fixed \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\). Writing \(f\) as

\[
f(\alpha, \beta, x, y) = \left[\alpha x + \beta y - \frac{2\alpha\beta(\alpha + \beta)}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}\right]^2 - \frac{4\alpha\beta(\beta - \alpha)}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \left[\beta x - \alpha y + \frac{\alpha^3 - \beta^3}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}\right],
\]

we see that, the axis of \(P\) is

\[\alpha x + \beta y = \frac{2\alpha\beta(\alpha + \beta)}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2},\]

and the tangent \(T\) at the vertex is

\[\beta x - \alpha y + \frac{\alpha^3 - \beta^3}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} = 0.\]

Note that the roots \(\sigma_1\) and \(\sigma_2\) are complex inside the parabola (with an obvious convention). If \(\alpha > \beta\), then the parabola is above \(T\); if \(\alpha < \beta\), then \(P\) lies below \(T\); if \(\alpha = \beta\) then the case is degenerate and \(P\) is the line \(x + y = 2\) (corresponding to \(A + B = 0\)).

Now let us consider the points \((1, 0)\) and \((0, 1)\) with respect to \(P\). The polar of \((1, 0)\), i.e. the chord of contact of the tangents from the point \((0, 1)\), is

\[f_1 = \alpha(\alpha x + \beta y) - 2\alpha\beta(x + y - 1),\]

and the power of \((1, 0)\) with respect to \(P\) is \(f_{11} = \alpha^2\). Therefore the tangents to \(P\) meeting at \((1, 0)\) are given by the line pair

\[0 = f_1^2 - f_{11} = \alpha^2(\beta - \alpha)(x - 1)(x + y - 1).\]
Likewise, the tangents to $P$ from $(0,1)$ are the line pair $(y-1)(x+y-1) = 0$. From an early result attributed to Lambert (1761) we know that the locus of the focus of parabolas with three specified tangent lines is the circle though the vertices of the triangle formed by the intersections of the lines; in this case the points $(0,1), (1,0)$ and $(1,1)$. As $\alpha$ and $\beta$ run over all positive values,

![Figure 4: Region of oscillatory behaviour (shaded) in the case $\alpha > \beta$. When $\alpha < \beta$ the oscillatory region is given by reflection in the line $y = x$.](image)

the three points of contact with $x = 1, y = 1,$ and $x + y = 1$, are seen to trace all points of these lines except those that lie in the region $\{x < 1\} \cap \{y < 1\}$. Thus these lines delineate the envelope of the parabolic region in which $m(t)$ is oscillatory; see figure 4.

Secondly, we consider whether $\sigma_1$ or $\sigma_2$ has positive real part (corresponding to potentially unbounded solutions for $m(t)$). If the roots are imaginary, $(\alpha, \beta)$ lying inside $P$, then (being conjugate) they have a positive real part if $\alpha x + \beta y < 0$. If the roots are real, then at least one is positive if either $\alpha x + \beta y < 0,$ or $x + y < 1$. The nature of the asymptotic behaviour of $m(t)$ as $t \to \infty$ is thus given in terms of the parameters $x$ and $y$; see figure 5. Alternatively, we may regard $A$ and $B$ and hence $x$ and $y$ fixed, and consider the quadratic form in $\alpha$ and $\beta$ given by

$$
\phi = \alpha^2 x^2 + 2\alpha\beta(xy - 2x - 2y + 2) + \beta^2 y^2.
$$

A necessary condition for this to take negative values is that it should be a real line pair, for which a necessary and condition is that $(xy - 2x - 2y + 2)^2 > x^2y^2$ which is equivalent to $(x - 1)(y - 1)(x + y - 1) < 0$. Note that the two regions of oscillatory behaviour in figure 5 do indeed satisfy this constraint. The oscillatory region in the $(\alpha, \beta)$ plane then comprises those opposite angles lying between the line pairs in which $\phi$ is negative. In the case when $x < 1, y < 1$
and \( x + y < 1 \), no part of this region lies in \( \{ \alpha > 0 \} \cap \{ \beta > 0 \} \), so there are no oscillatory solutions there.

Of course, we may also seek a solution of (5.2) as a power series in \( t \). In the usual way, the indicial equation is found to be \( c(c - \alpha + 1)(c - \beta + 1) = 0 \), which supplies the required three linearly independent solutions in the ordinary case when \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are neither equal nor differ by an integer. In these cases the method of Frobenius may generally be employed to yield the required distinct solution in series. We refrain from an extended discussion. However we do mention the special case when the boundary condition is \( \tau = 0 \) with \( x(0) = 1 \). In this instance, in general, the power series corresponding to \( c = 0 \), with the form \( m(t) = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} a_r t^r \), supplies the solution that is regular at the origin. For example, if \( A = B = 1 \) then it is seen that \( m(t) \sim t^\sigma \) with \( \sigma = [\alpha \beta]^{1/2} \).

If it is further assumed that \( \alpha \beta = 4 \) where neither \( \alpha \) nor \( \beta \) is an integer, then (5.2) has the solution \( m(t) = 1 + t + 3t^2/[2(\alpha + \beta) + 12] \), by inspection. By the remarks above, this is the required \( m(t) \) satisfying the boundary conditions \( m(0) = m'(0) = 1 \) and is such that \( m(t) \) grows quadratically as \( t \to \infty \).

### 5.1 The second moment in the generalized case

In considering the second moment \( q(t) = EX^2(t) \) of the process \( X(t) \) of definition 5.1, we will make the assumption that \( \alpha = \beta > 0 \), thus excluding the oscillatory behaviour. We have this:
Theorem 10. As $t \to \infty$, $q(t) \sim Kt^\sigma$ where
\[ \sigma = \alpha \max \{A^2 + B^2 - 1, 2(A + B - 1)\}, \]
and $K$ is a constant depending on $A$, $B$ and $\alpha$ and initial conditions.

Proof. Let $q$ throughout, using (5.3), we have this equation for $\partial c$ with a similar equation for $Q$
process during $K$ and $Q$
Finally, we briefly discuss the effects on $X(t)$ if at each jump $X(T_r) = A_rX(U_r) + B_rX(V_r)$
where now $(A_r)$ and $(B_r)$ comprise sequences of independent random variables, also independent
of $(U_r, V_r)$, with means $\mu_A = EA_r$ and $\mu_B = EB_r$ respectively. It is easy to see that in (5.1)
and (5.2), one simply replaces $A$ and $B$ by $\mu_A$ and $\mu_B$. The essential conclusions in figure 6
are the same, with some relabelling. For the second moment, we note that the product moment
$E(AB)$ is irrelevant to first order. The end result is that $q(t)$ grows with $t^\sigma$ where now $\sigma = \alpha \max \{2(\mu_A + \mu_B - 1), E\alpha^2 + E\beta^2 - 1\}$. The nature of the final figure will then be similar, but
dependent on the actual distributions of $A$ and $B$, as expressed in their first two moments.
Figure 6: Outside the circle centred at $(1, 1)$, the second moment increases or decreases as $t^{\sigma_1}$ depending on the sign of $\sigma_1 = \alpha(A^2 + B^2 - 1)$ Within this circle it grows as $t^{\sigma_2}$, where $\sigma_2 = 2\alpha(A + B - 1)$; decreasing in the shaded region and otherwise increasing. The Ulam case is at the point $\circ$.

6 Conclusion

We have considered Ulam’s random adding process, introduced in Beyer, Schrandt and Ulam (1969), and verified the authors’ conjecture about the quadratic growth of the process’s second moment. We have also introduced a number of new, more general random adding processes, in both discrete and continuous time, showing that their moments exhibit similar behaviour. Furthermore, for the basic simple Ulam process of section 2, we showed that $M_n = S_n/(n(n + 1))$ converges almost surely and in mean-square to a limiting random variable $M$. The result depended crucially on the identification of a martingale. Although we have been unable to find amenable martingales for either the general $p$-adding case or the continuized process when considering $S(t)/t^2$ as $t \to \infty$, it seems likely that similar convergence results will apply. A possible approach is to establish mean-square convergence by showing that the random sequence is Cauchy in mean-square. Our preliminary investigations suggest that the limit results in theorems 5 and 8 are not precise enough for this purpose and that higher order approximations will be necessary. Finally, we note that there are many further obvious and interesting open problems about almost every aspect of this largely unexplored family of random processes.
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